

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/760,662	01/20/2004	Daniel Nachtigal	02-0044	3714	
29293	7590 08/30/2006	EXAMINER			
FREUDENBERG-NOK GENERAL PARTNERSHIP LEGAL DEPARTMENT 47690 EAST ANCHOR COURT PLYMOUTH, MI 48170-2455			MULCAHY	MULCAHY, PETER D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1713	· <u>-</u> .	

DATE MAILED: 08/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

/	
L	•

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/760,662	NACHTIGAL ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Peter D. Mulcahy	1713		

Advisory Action	10/760,662	62 NACHTIGAL ET AL.				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Peter D. Mulcahy	1713	1			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
	THE REPLY FILED 14 August 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.					
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:</li> <li>a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</li> </ol>						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL						
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).  AMENDMENTS						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because  (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for						
appeal; and/or (d) $\square$ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mnliant Amendment (	PTOL_324)			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	:	impliant Amendment (	1 101-324).			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).						
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ⊠ wi vided below or appended.	ll be entered and an e	xplanation of			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3-12,14,15,35-41,43-45,65,66,68 and</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	<del>170-73</del> .					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	t before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affiday	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fai	Is to provide a			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER						
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	ice because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	Peter D. Mulcally	,			
		Primary Examiner				

Art Unit: 1713/

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The rejection currently of record remains proper. There is no patentable distinction in identifying the phases and/or the limiting the curing to dynamic vulcanization. The phases are seen to be inherent within the art and the dynamic vulcanization is an obvious species of curing. There are no allegations or showing of unexpected results of record.